

IV. REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 28 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification and drawings are objected to. Claim 6 is objected to for alleged informalities. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. as allegedly being unpatentable over Ylonen *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,612), hereafter “Ylonen.” Claims 2-26 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ylonen.

A. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Office has objected to the specification for informalities. Specifically, the Office objects to the term “nested confections” in the specification. Applicant has amended the specification to change the term to “nested connections.” Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office withdraw its objection.

B. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office has objected to the drawings, specifically Fig. 2, as allegedly describing prior art. The Office bases this objection on a statement in the specification that recites “In previous systems, a connection arrangement such as that depicted in Fig. 2 posed numerous problems.” Applicant respectfully submits that, contrary to the Office’s assertion that the statement indicates that the figure is directed to prior art, the description cited by the Office indicates that the arrangement in Fig. 2 could not be accomplished in the prior art due to the numerous problems posed by such an arrangement. To this extent, Applicant respectfully submits that the statement in the specification supports the absence of a label of “Prior Art” on Fig. 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIM 1-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office has asserted that claims 1-31 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For example, the Office states that the term “IKE traffic” is not understood. Applicant has amended the claims to recite “...wherein the IKE traffic is traffic using IKE protocols.” In addition, the Office states that it does not understand the term outside of the VPN connection, stating that there may be multiple VPN connections and it is not clear to which the term outside applies to. Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear from the context of the claims and VPN connection that the IKE traffic is outside is the VPN connection referred to earlier as, “a VPN connection.” Still further, the Office states that the phrase “refreshing IKE traffic” is unclear. Applicant has

amended claims 5, 12 and 28 to include "...wherein the refreshing IKE traffic is used to refresh security associations."

The Office yet still further indicates that the phrase "nested VPN connection" is not clear, citing claim 8. Applicant has amended claim 8 to clarify that the phrase "pertaining to a nested VPN connection" applies to the IKE traffic and does not intend to provide a nested connection outside of a nested connection. Yet still further, the Office states that the phrase "replacing the potential VPN connection with the nested VPN connection. Applicant has amended the claim to indicate that it is the entry that changes and not the connection itself. Yet still further, the Office states that claim 17 never establishes a VPN connection. Applicant has amended claim 17 to include establishing a VPN connection. Applicant asserts that these amendment further clarify the invention. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

D. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1-32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AND 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(c) and §103(a) rejections over Ylonen, Applicant asserts that Ylonen does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 14, 17, 20 and 24, Applicant submits that Ylonen fails to teach or suggest an IKE traffic enablement system for automatically allowing IKE traffic from outside the VPN to flow into the VPN if the IKE traffic permit filters are not detected. In contrast, the passages of Ylonen cited by the Office do not indicate an ability to allow IKE traffic from outside the VPN to flow into the VPN if IKE traffic permit filters are not detected. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 9, 14, 20 and 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Ylonen also fails to teach or suggest an IKE traffic management system for managing the IKE traffic through VPN connections after the VPN connections have been established. Rather, in Ylonen the management, if any occurs prior to establishing of a connection. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

V. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2008

/Hunter E. Webb/

Hunter E. Webb

Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC

75 State Street, 14th Floor

Albany, New York 12207

(518) 449-0044

(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew